

**Enclosure 1**  
**EPA Comments on the**  
**Portland Harbor Joint Source Control Strategy Milestone Report – March 2006**

---

**General**

Comments: Much of the explanation of how sources are identified is in the JSCS, why is it rewritten in the Milestone Report?

**Section 2.0**

Comments: Why is a detailed discussion about when the sources were identified in relation to the NPL listing in this Report? Why is it relevant to reporting on how the JSCS is being implemented? Is there a substantive difference in how the JSCS is being applied to a facility due to the timeframe the source was identified? If so, what is the substantive difference?

Comments: Section 2.1, page 5 states that the NPL listing “curtailed” the strategy recommendations for potential sources, but in Section 2.2. it is stated that DEQ’s site discovery and assessment work continued after the listing. These statements are inconsistent. Again, why is this discussion in the Report if it is not substantively relevant to how the JSCS is being implemented? If it is relevant to how the JSCS is being implemented, please explain.

**Section 3.0**

Comments: Page 5-6, **Direct discharges**: Are there any POTW discharges within the ISA? POTWs can be potential sources when industrial users discharge waste water and storm water to the POTW and the pollutants are not regulated adequately.

**Section 6.0**

*These comments are tied to Section 7.4.6 of the PH JSCS. “DEQ will identify **issues affecting the ability to make source control decisions or completeness determinations, for any step of the source control process** (i.e., identification, characterization, and implementation). In addition, DEQ will **propose ways to resolve issues and a desired timeframe for resolution.**”*

Comments: Page 9, **Issue 1**: Why are these six facilities singled out as needed accelerated schedules for source control work? Are they unwilling to work with DEQ in controlling sources? The milestone report is not clear on why these facilities are an issue for source control; it just states “For a number of different reasons...”

What part of the source control process is there an issue? Is there a particular pathway that is problematic?

**Enclosure 1**  
**EPA Comments on the**  
**Portland Harbor Joint Source Control Strategy Milestone Report – March 2006**

---

The resolution was for “...DEQ... to first identify the sites then accelerate their schedule for source control work.” This (to first identify) sound like DEQ needs to identify sites with potential sources, which has already been done. If the intent of DEQ was to state that the sites that are not progressing at an acceptable pace need to be identified by DEQ, it was not portrayed in this sentence. The second resolution (accelerate their schedule for source control work) seems to imply that the problem is with DEQ PM’s schedule management. Is this true?

Additionally, a timeframe was not provided for resolving this issue other than “DEQ will report on efforts to accelerate source control work at these sites in the next Milestone Report (June 2006).” Does this mean that DEQ plans to resolve this issue for these sites by June 2006?

Suggested changes: DEQ should strike first sentence from the second paragraph.

Provide the issue(s) for each facility in a sub-issue (e.g., Issue 1a: Premier Edible Oil). Briefly state the issue(s) for the site, including the pathway(s) and process(s) that are problematic. Present the proposed resolution(s) for dealing with issue (this may be a process including meetings, letters, orders, schedule modifications, etc.). Finally, DEQ needs to provide a timeframe for resolving the issue with the facility (e.g., June 2006). DEQ should report on the status of each issue in subsequent milestone reports.

Comments: Page 10, **Issue 2**: Why is Gasco separated from the facilities in Issue 1? The milestone report is not clear on why the Gasco facility is an issue for source control. This issue/resolution implies that the problem is with DEQ PM’s schedule management (second sentence in second paragraph) and the fact that Gasco is still collecting information when they were listed by DEQ as an active site in 1999. Is the problem really with DEQ management or with data collection or something else? There is no timeframe proposed for resolving this issue.

Suggested changes: Briefly state the issue(s) for the site, including the pathway(s) and process(s) that are problematic. Present the proposed resolution(s) for dealing with issue (this may be a process including meetings, letters, orders, schedule modifications, etc.). Finally, DEQ needs to provide a timeframe for resolving the issue with the facility (e.g., June 2006). DEQ should report on the status of each issue in subsequent milestone reports.

## **Tables**

*These comments are tied to Section 7.4.1 of the PH JSCS. “DEQ is evaluating and identifying potential upland sources of contamination to Portland Harbor to determine if further investigation or source control measures are required. DEQ will **present a table***

**Enclosure 1**  
**EPA Comments on the**  
**Portland Harbor Joint Source Control Strategy Milestone Report – March 2006**

---

*of potential upland sources identified through upland site discovery activities (see Appendix B for more information) and the status of their review.”*

Comments: It appears that Tables 1, 2 and 3 provide the list of sites that are potential upland sources. It is unclear why DEQ chose to provide this information in three tables rather than one, as described in the PH JSCS, other than to point out the timing of discovery. This could have been done in one table. It is also unclear why DEQ did not include all properties adjacent to the Willamette River as potential upland sources for at least the storm water pathway. Did DEQ use the JSCS screening values in prioritizing all identified facilities in all of the tables?

Comments: **Table 1:** Why is the information in Table 1 different from Tables 2 and 3? Why aren't Time Oil and ARCO listed in Table 4? The information (project management input and DEQ Follow-Up) in Table 1 is not necessary for the milestone report and some of the information in seems out of date and may misrepresent the upland source.

Comments: **Table 2:** Why aren't Alder Creek Lumber, Babcock Land Company, LLC, City of Portland Water Pollution Lab, Columbia Sand & Gravel, Hampton Lumber Sales/CMI NW, Hendren Tow Boats, RK Storage, Santa Fe Pacific Pipeline, and Transloader International (General Construction Company) listed in Table 4?

Comments: **Tables 2 & 3:** EPA does not understand DEQ's priority scheme in these tables. Only PA, XPA, and RI are listed as high priority giving the impression that DEQ is still investigating all these sites and has not conducted any source control measures at these sites. It also gives the impression that DEQ has not listed any sites as high priority because high-priority sites are expected to move forward with aggressive source control measures and these sites are still in the investigation phase.

Comments: **Table 4:** Why aren't Esco Landfill Sauvie Island, Gasco/Siltronic, Koppers Inc., Texaco Product Pipeline, and Vanwater and Rogers listed in Tables 1, 2 or 3? Why are there listings for Gasco, Siltronic, and Gasco/Siltronic? What are the differences between these sites? Facilities in Table 4 have different names than those in Tables 1, 2 or 3, which makes it difficult to compare tables. Information in column 7 does not reflect current status from other information in table. Why is the information in column 6 important for the Milestone Report? The City of Portland outfalls are only storm water conveyance system rather than a site: no need to list other pathways. The City of Portland has many outfalls with different activities and priorities at each one. The table should list each outfall as pathway and then describe SCE/SCD for each one. Why are headings in Table 4 different from the PH JSCS?

**Enclosure 1**  
**EPA Comments on the**  
**Portland Harbor Joint Source Control Strategy Milestone Report – March 2006**

---

Comment: Site names in Tables 1, 2 and 3 do not match those in Table 4.

Suggested changes: DEQ should provide one table that is a comprehensive list all sites that have been considered, historically or currently, a potential upland source to the Willamette River, including those sites that DEQ has already determined are not a source through their investigation process. This will show that DEQ has considered all sources of contamination to the Superfund Site. Information in this table should be limited to site identification (e.g., site name [common, legal, and former, as applicable], site address, ESCI #, river mile, etc.) (Tables 2 & 3, columns 1 & 2; Table 4, columns 1, 2, 3 & 4), name of DEQ PM (Table 4, column 5), contamination migration pathways (Table 4, column 9), project status for each pathway (e.g., not started, PA, XPA, RI, completed) (Table 4, column 7), major SCE tasks to be completed for each pathway (Table 4, column 11), and expected SCE completion date (month and year) or completion date if project status is completed (Table 4, column 12?).

*These comments are tied to Section 7.4.2 of the PH JSCS. “Preliminary investigation activities at upland sites are designed to determine if a site is an ongoing source of contamination to the river. Sites that are identified as current or potential sources will be characterized and prioritized, and then may require either initiation of source control measures or further evaluation to determine if source control measures are required. DEQ will **present a table of confirmed sources** of contamination to the river, the **basis for that determination**, and the **priority of the site** for source control. High-priority sites will be identified in the initial Milestone Report based on existing site information, and subsequent Milestone Reports will identify any new high-priority sites as new information becomes available. Source control is expected to move forward at high-priority sites without delay.”*

Comments: Table 4 did not specifically provide the basis for the determination of confirmed sources; it was included in Column 13 **Pathway determination**. A confirmed source is one that has a potential or complete contaminant migration pathway to the Willamette River and has contaminants of interest to the Portland Harbor Superfund Site. DEQ only provided whether the pathway was complete, insignificant, or incomplete; there was no information on contaminants. The term ‘insignificant’ should not need to be used since there is no definition provided. It would be better to provide a basis that contaminants of interest are not a concern (e.g., contaminants within 1 order of magnitude of SLV, contaminants comply with NPDES permit limits, etc.) and rank the pathway as low priority (Table 4, column 14).

Comments: The JSCS provided that the priority scheme would result from comparing data from each media to the JSCS SLVs and, along with other information

**Enclosure 1**  
**EPA Comments on the**  
**Portland Harbor Joint Source Control Strategy Milestone Report – March 2006**

---

known, a high, medium, or low priority would be given to each identified source. High priority sources would be facilities that needed to move to source control action and stop further investigations and assessment. This scheme does not appear to be applied in the Tables.

Suggested changes: DEQ should provide one table that is a comprehensive list all sites that have been identified as a confirmed upland source to the Willamette River. This table should include the site name (same name as used in potential upland sources table), basis for the determination that this is a confirmed source (e.g., storm water - complete pathway for copper, phthalates, and PCBs), and site priority (Table 4, column 15). DEQ may include this information in the same table as the potential upland sources. Additionally DEQ may provide the determination for why a particular pathway is not a confirmed source (e.g., Overland transport/sheet flow - incomplete pathway: berm prevents overland pathway) and priority level for each pathway (Table 4, column 14).

*These comments are tied to Section 7.4.3 of the PH JSCS. “Source control decisions conducted at upland sites will [be] briefly summarized. The Milestone Reports will include a **summary of the source control evaluation**, the **basis for determination that upland source control measures are necessary**, a **summary of the selected source control measure**, and a **schedule for implementation** of the source control measure. DEQ will present a **table of the source control decisions for each contaminant migration pathway for confirmed or potential sources of contamination to the river.**”*

Comments: A summary of the source control evaluation was not provided other than the source was complete, insignificant, or incomplete. This is not enough information about the source control evaluation to identify a confirmed source (See comments for Section 7.4.2.). The basis for upland source control measures was not adequately provided in Table 4 (columns 13, 14 and 15). Examples of adequate basis would be: contaminants 2 or more order(s) of magnitude above SLV; contaminants exceed NPDES permit limits; etc. Not all SCMs are provided in Table 4, column 18 (e.g., Paving at Calbag Metals for storm water). A schedule for implementation of each SCM is not provided in Table 4: column 20 provides the completion date (month, year) for each SCM, although not all entries provide a date; column 22 provides a schedule for SCM, although only limited or no schedule information is provided (a schedule consists of more than just a SCM due date – See additional comments on Section 7.4.4); and column 23 provides the date SCM is complete, which is the same information provided in column 20. The columns in Table 4 do not progress in logical order in the source control process which makes it difficult to determine where DEQ is in the source control process.

**Enclosure 1**  
**EPA Comments on the**  
**Portland Harbor Joint Source Control Strategy Milestone Report – March 2006**

---

Comments: Section 9.0, page 15, second paragraph, indicates that sites that have completed upland source control are shaded. These sites were all given priority of low or medium. Why did DEQ chose to proceed on these sites when there are other high-priority sites that are still being evaluated? If these sites were high priority for source control and are now low priority because of DEQ source control efforts, then they should be identified as high priority sites, but DEQ could add another column for post-SCD site priority where they can indicate that the site is now low priority. For some pathways at some sites, DEQ indicated “no SCM necessary” in Table 4, column 18, without providing any explanation for this. Why do some entries have “N/A” and others state “no SCM necessary?” What is the difference?

Suggested changes: Make suggested changes for Section 7.4.2. Include list of contaminants evaluated and basis for upland source control measures. Make sure all SCMs implemented for each pathway at each site are included in Table 4, column 18. Be consistent in entering information. Provide a schedule with milestones (proposed activities and estimated completion dates) for all SCMs, including those that have been completed. DEQ should add a column for SCD where it is indicated either “SCM needed” or “no SCM needed.” Table should progress in order of source control process.

*These comments are tied to Section 7.4.4 of the PH JSCS. “For ongoing source control measures, a summary of their status will be provided in the Milestone Reports. The status report will summarize **activities completed to date, proposed activities, and a target schedule for completion.** To the extent practical, DEQ will collect information and/or make **estimates of the mass or volume** of contaminants removed, contained, treated or otherwise controlled, in order to help communicate to stakeholders on the progress of source control activities.”*

Comments: See comments for Section 7.4.3 regarding SCM schedule. Why hasn’t DEQ provided mass or volume of contaminants removed, contained, treated or otherwise controlled when SCM complete? To help in evaluating whether the source control being taken will be effective or consistent with the Harbor cleanup, the performance standards, e.g., cleanup levels, that DEQ set in each media needs to be provided for each completed source control measure.

Suggested changes: Make suggested changes for Section 7.4.3. Provide mass or volume of contaminants removed, contained, treated or otherwise controlled for completed SCMs. Include clean-up levels for completed activities.

*These comments are tied to Section 7.4.5 of the PH JSCS. “A summary of **complete source control measures** will be provided in the Milestone Reports. The status report*

**Enclosure 1**  
**EPA Comments on the**  
**Portland Harbor Joint Source Control Strategy Milestone Report – March 2006**

---

*will provide a description of the source control measure, the date the source control measures was complete, the date of EPA review and comment, and any operation and maintenance requirements.”*

Comments: See comments for Sections 7.4.3 and 7.4.4 regarding completed source control measures. DEQ has provided three places for EPA review and comment in the process: (1) review of SCE; (2) review of SCM selection; and (3) review of completed SCM. Make sure that the data in these columns is correct (e.g., there are places where the information for SCE review is in the SCM evaluation column). Information in these columns can be minimized (e.g., waiting on SCE, submitted 10/2004 no comments received, submitted 10/2004 comments received 11/2004, etc.)

*These comments are tied to Section 7.4.7 of the PH JSCS. “DEQ will provide the **source control schedule** and quarterly updates to the schedule (See Section 6.0) **in order of site priority**. The schedule will list the **site name, priority, known contaminant migration pathways, status of source control documents** (i.e., Source Control Evaluation, Source Control Decision, Source Control Design; and Implementation Report). Target dates that have changes will be listed and an explanation for the change will be reported.”*

Comments: See comments for Sections 7.4.1 through 7.4.5. Why didn't DEQ put these in order of site priority? Is Table 4, column 17 (Source control alternative evaluation and schedule) the same as Source Control Design? Why isn't there a column for the Implementation Report? Will EPA get to review this document as allowed in the PH JSCS Section 7.3? Is this the purpose for Table 4, column 24?

Suggested changes: The facilities should be listed by priority so that all high priority facilities would be listed first (maybe in a different color), medium second, and low last. The headings in the table should match those in the PH JSCS.